

Remarks

The objections of the Examiner with regard to the Information Disclosure Statement filed 15 September 2005 have been overcome by a subsequent Information Disclosure Statement dated 5 November 2009.

The Applicant assumes that the Examiner's requirement for restriction has been made final, and that therefore Claims 10-17 are withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner's assumption with regard to Claim 23 is correct. Appropriate amendments have been made to Claim 23.

Independent Claims 1, 18, 21 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over US 2004/0066769 to Ahmavarra et al in view of US 2004/0098588 to Ohba et al. Nowhere does either Ahmavarra et al in or Ohba et al. show or suggest:

“transmitting set-up parameters from the communications network to the client terminal, the set-up parameters including information for establishing a signaling connection tunnel between the client terminal and the communications network for transferring control data;

establishing the control data signaling connection tunnel using the set-up parameters;

transmitting signaling information between the client terminal and the communications network via the control data signal connection tunnel; and

closing the authentication connection”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 1. Ahmavarra et al discloses a tunnel between authentication server 50 and access server 40 (page 4, ¶0052), and between access server 40 and gateway 60 (page 6, ¶0094). However, nowhere does Ahmavarra et al show or suggest any tunnel to

client terminal 10. Similarly, nowhere does Ohba et al show or suggest any tunnel to a client terminal. It is therefore clear that neither Ahmavarra et al nor Ohba et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Similarly, nowhere does either Ahmavarra et al in or Ohba et al. show or suggest:

“at said client terminal, receiving an authentication message from said communication network, said authentication message including set-up parameters defining a control data signaling connection tunnel between said client terminal and said communications network;

from said client terminal, setting up said control data signaling connection tunnel by use of said set-up parameters;

transmitting control information between said client terminal and said communications network via said control data signaling connection tunnel; and

closing said authentication connection”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 18. Rather, as explained above, Ahmavarra et al discloses a tunnel between authentication server 50 and access server 40 (page 4, ¶0052), and between access server 40 and gateway 60 (page 6, ¶0094). However, nowhere does Ahmavarra et al show or suggest any tunnel to client terminal 10. Similarly, nowhere does Ohba et al show or suggest any tunnel to a client terminal. It is therefore clear that neither Ahmavarra et al nor Ohba et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 18.

Similarly, nowhere does either Ahmavarra et al in or Ohba et al. show or suggest:

“establishing by said mobile device a tunnel with said communications network;

forwarding by said mobile device to said communications network acknowledgment of receipt of said parameters and an indication to said communications network that said tunnel has been established;

receiving by said mobile device an indication from said communications network of completion of authorization to communicate with said communications network through an access point;

terminating receipt of said authentication by said mobile device;
and

opening a connection through said established tunnel”,

as specifically set forth in independent Claim 21. Rather, as explained above, Ahmavarra et al discloses a tunnel between authentication server 50 and access server 40 (page 4, ¶0052), and between access server 40 and gateway 60 (page 6, ¶0094). However, nowhere does Ahmavarra et al show or suggest any tunnel to client terminal 10. Similarly, nowhere does Ohba et al show or suggest any tunnel to a client terminal. It is therefore clear that neither Ahmavarra et al nor Ohba et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 21.

Similarly, nowhere does either Ahmavarra et al or Ohba et al. show or suggest:

“means for receiving by said mobile device a signaling request including parameters from said communications network for establishing a signaling connection tunnel;

means for forwarding by said mobile device to said communications network acknowledgment of receipt of said parameters and an indication to said communications network that said tunnel has been established;

means for receiving by said mobile device an indication from said communications network of completion of authorization to communicate with said communications network through an access point;

means for closing said radio connection by said mobile device; and

means for opening a connection through said established tunnel”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 27 as amended. Rather, as explained above, Ahmavarra et al discloses a tunnel between authentication server 50 and access server 40 (page 4, ¶0052), and

between access server 40 and gateway 60 (page 6, ¶0094). However, nowhere does Ahmavarra et al show or suggest any tunnel to client terminal 10. Similarly, nowhere does Ohba et al show or suggest any tunnel to a client terminal. It is therefore clear that neither Ahmavarra et al nor Ohba et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 27.

Claims 2-9 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claims 19 and 20 are dependent from Claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

Claims 22-26 are dependent from Claim 21 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 21.

The Examiner has cited US 7,260,061 to Pellert against subclaims 3 and 9. Pellert shows a tunnel 124 between interworking units (column 4, lines 44-47). Nowhere does Pellert show or suggest a tunnel to a client terminal. It is therefore clear that Pellert does not affect the patentability of parent Claim 1, much less the patentability of subclaims 3 and 9.

The Examiner has cited US 2005/0210251 to Nyberg et al against subclaims 4 and 22. Nowhere does Nyberg et al show or suggest:

“transmitting set-up parameters from the communications network to the client terminal, the set-up parameters including information for establishing a signaling connection tunnel between the client terminal and the communications network for transferring control data;

establishing the control data signaling connection tunnel using the set-up parameters;

transmitting signaling information between the client terminal and the communications network via the control data signal connection tunnel; and

closing the authentication connection”,

as set forth in parent Claim 1. Furthermore, nowhere does Nyberg et al show or suggest:

“establishing by said mobile device a tunnel with said communications network;

forwarding by said mobile device to said communications network acknowledgment of receipt of said parameters and an indication to said communications network that said tunnel has been established;

receiving by said mobile device an indication from said communications network of completion of authorization to communicate with said communications network through an access point;

terminating receipt of said authentication by said mobile device;
and

opening a connection through said established tunnel”,

as specifically set forth in independent Claim 21. It is therefore clear that Nyberg et al does not affect the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 21, much less, the patentability of dependent Claims 4 and 22.

US 2004/0054794 to Lantto et al has been cited against dependent Claim 8. Nowhere does Lantto et al show or suggest:

“transmitting set-up parameters from the communications network to the client terminal, the set-up parameters including information for establishing a signaling connection tunnel between the client terminal and the communications network for transferring control data;

establishing the control data signaling connection tunnel using the set-up parameters;

transmitting signaling information between the client terminal and the communications network via the control data signal connection tunnel; and

closing the authentication connection”,

as set forth in parent Claim 1. It is therefore clear that the patentability of parent Claim 1 is not affected by Lantto et al, much less the patentability of dependent Claim 8.

The Applicant therefore submits that Claims 1-9 and 18-27 are now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is hereby solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Guillaume Bichot

/Daniel E. Sragow/

by Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: January 15, 2010